

COVIL CORPORATION, by and)
through its duly appointed receiver,)
Peter D. Protopapas,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.)
)
USF&G COMPANY, et al.,)
)
Defendants.)

USF&G COMPANY, et al.,)
)
 Defendants.)


Defendant USF&G moves to compel disclosure of Covil's settlement agreements with various other entities. See Doc. 399. The Magistrate Judge granted the motion in part, requiring Covil to produce limited portions of its settlement agreement with Zurich. Doc. 408. The Magistrate Judge denied the motion to the extent USF&G sought discovery of settlement agreements with other entities and of the full agreement with Zurich. USF&G objects to the Magistrate Judge's order in part, specifically to his conclusion that Covil did not have to disclose settlement agreements with Hartford, TIG, and Sentry. See Doc. 428. Covil has not objected and has complied with the Magistrate Judge's order. See Doc. 431.

Case 1:18-cv-00932-CCE-LPA Document 435 Filed 07/09/21 Page 1 of 2

Upon consideration of USF&G's arguments, the Court declines to reverse or vacate the Magistrate Judge's decision, Doc. 408, which remains the Order of the court.

It is **ORDERED** that the defendant USF&G's objections, Doc. 428, to the Magistrate Judge's order, Doc. 408, are **OVERRULED** and the motion to compel disclosure of settlement agreements, Doc. 399, is **DENIED** to the extent and for the reasons stated by the Magistrate Judge.

This the 9th day of July, 2021.



UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE